DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 743 EA 032 649

AUTHOR	Schwartz, Fran; Silin, Jonathan
TITLE	Alysha's Day: Progressive Pedagogy as School Reform.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	98p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Class Activities; Classroom Design; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Cooperative Learning; Curriculum Development; *Educational Improvement; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Independent Study; Instructional Development; Learning Activities; *Learning Strategies; Student Attitudes; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that progressive pedagogy is a viable alternative to more limited basic skill approaches to school reform. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative data collected during the fourth year of a 7-year multi-site school reform initiative in a besieged urban district, the paper documents ways in which teachers have dramatically altered the physical and social organization of their classroom, used an enhanced repertoire of instructional strategies, and redirected students to solve their own social and intellectual problems. In turn, children have become self-reliant. They work collaboratively with one another and make choices about the pacing of their learning. Yet teachers seldom draw on children's immediate interests and extra-classroom lives to construct curriculum. What emerges is a hybrid curriculum in which new social structures support traditional learning objectives. The paper concludes that in struggling districts it may be easier to shift classroom culture than to change curriculum content. (Contains 65 references.) (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 743

Alysha's Day: Progressive Pedagogy as School Reform.

Fran Schwartz
Jonathan Silin

April 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Schwartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

EA 032 649

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alysha's Day:
Progressive Pedagogy As School Reform

Fran Schwartz, Ph.D.
Jonathan G. Silin, Ed.D.

Project New Beginnings
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

Paper Presented at the American
Educational Research Association Meeting
Chicago, Illinois
April, 2003

EA032649

Abstract

In this paper we argue that progressive pedagogy is a viable alternative to more limited basic skill approaches to school reform. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative data collected during the 4th year of a 7 year, multi-site school reform initiative in a besieged urban district, we document the ways in which teachers have dramatically altered the physical and social organization of their classrooms, use an enhanced repertoire of instructional strategies and redirect students to solve their own social and intellectual problems. In turn, children have become self-reliant. They work collaboratively with one another, and make choices about the pacing of their learning. Yet, teachers seldom draw on children's immediate interests and extra-classroom lives to construct curriculum. What emerges is a hybrid curriculum in which new social structures support traditional learning objectives. We conclude that in struggling districts it may be easier to shift classroom culture than to change curricular content.

Alysha's Day:
Progressive Pedagogy As School Reform

"It's time for centers," announces Ms. Davis. Many children clap. "The centers which are open this afternoon are dramatic play, blocks, sand and water table, and cooking with me. Writing, math, tabletop toys and listening centers are open too. No painting today. It's too messy while we are cooking." Alysha turns to Shaquira as Ms. Davis mentions each center. At the end of the list she says, "Let's do blocks. We can build a big house again." Shaquira responds, "I don't know. Let's go to dramatic play and do that family game again." Alysha thinks for moment and suggests, "Ok, how about we do blocks today and then the family game tomorrow." Shaquira agrees. When Alysha turns to Jamie with the suggestion that he join them, she receives a definite rebuff to her overture, "No way, I want to cook!"

For educators trained in developmentally appropriate practices the scenario described above is unexceptional, an example of what happens in good early childhood classrooms. The children are presented with a wide range of choices that encourage them to rehearse decision-making skills and to express individual interests and talents. While the teacher exercises her managerial judgment by limiting the number of messy activities, cooking but no painting this day, it is clear that she will need to rely on the children's well-developed social skills to manage in the many open centers. There is a balance between more academic centers such as writing and math and those whose problem-solving activities also offer opportunities to learn about the social world through blocks and dramatic play (Cuffaro, 1995).

And yet to our eyes, as directors of research for Project New Beginnings, a multi-year school reform initiative in Newark, New Jersey, a scene that reflects such a mundane menu of activities conceals within it an extraordinary success story. Five years

earlier, the majority of kindergarten children spent most of their days seated behind desks attempting to follow whole group lessons or complete worksheets with little or no access to materials other than paper, pencil, and crayons. Their accomplishments were measured by a forty-page test administered at the end of the year and teachers were held accountable by administrators for the daily goals and objectives posted on the chalkboard. Today the shift from teacher-centered to child-centered practices is firmly in place. The new freedoms and learning opportunities made possible by a less prescriptive approach to early childhood education afford everyone greater choices about, and responsibilities for, their lives in the classroom.

In this paper we argue that in besieged urban school districts traditional classrooms can be transformed into more student friendly settings that promote independence, choice making, an ethic of community care, as well as the skills required for academic success. At the same time, however, we

demonstrate that these changes are not uniform. Shifts in the physical and social structures of the classrooms occur sooner and more systematically than the uneven and sometimes superficial changes in curricular content. Project New Beginnings, grounded in notions of developmentally appropriate practice and progressive education was far more successful in promoting student-centered classrooms than socially relevant curriculum. Our data confirm that effective reforms are often hybrid in nature, neither what the reformers initially intend nor the district believes it needs (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Although we report here about the progress made in one particularly hard pressed city -- under state takeover, subject to heightened concerns for accountability and student outcomes on standardized tests, overflowing with optional and court mandated change agents -- we believe that our findings have implications for many urban school reform initiatives. These implications concern respecting the "wisdom of practice" that teachers bring to their work, adapting to local

conditions, and focusing on the seemingly small less dramatic shifts in student teacher interactions that often signal larger changes in children's school experiences (Fullan, 2001; McLaughlin, 1998; Schulman, 1987).

In the sections that follow we look at the contexts of change -- past attempts to bring both progressive practices and early childhood programs to public schools, the theoretical underpinnings of New Beginnings, the realities of Newark and the programs devised to meet those realities. We have constructed "Alysha's Day," a composite portrait of one child's day, to capture the experiences of students in New Beginnings classrooms and to organize our data. Finally, we offer possible explanations for the discrepancies between the changes in structure and content of classroom life: Why this particular hybrid at this particular time and place?

Contexts of Change

New Beginnings is by no means the first attempt to promote progressive education in public schools

(Cremin, 1964; Kliebard, 1995; Ravitch, 2000). Its story, however, offers a unique perspective on what works in contemporary urban districts. Bank Street College of Education, home of Project New Beginnings, has played an active role in bringing more child-centered approaches to public venues. It launched a staff development program in the New York City schools during the 1940's, a Follow Through Model in the late 1960's and 1970s, and on-going curriculum supports to districts across the country in the following decades (Shapiro, in press). While recent studies have documented the effectiveness of progressive practices within public settings (Bensman, 2000; Wasley et al, 2000), others have called for more rigorous research that will stand up to the close scrutiny of skeptical legislators and policy makers in the era of highstakes testing and accountability (Lagemann, 2002). We believe our data will contribute to a better understanding of how and why progressive practices are effective with young children in public schools.

A Child-Centered Model

In the late 1960's and early 1970's researchers at Bank Street College moved to codify the body of theory and practice that had been developed there in the preceding decades (Biber, 1967; Biber & Franklin, 1967; Shapiro & Biber, 1972). As they prepared to enter the competition for newly available federal funding in early childhood, the Bank Street researchers crafted a curriculum model that drew on social philosophers such as John Dewey and George Counts, educators like Lucy Sprague Mitchell and Charlotte Windsor, and developmental theorists including Anna Freud, Erik Erikson, Kurt Lewin, Jean Piaget and Heinz Werner. The three fundamental tenets of this approach include:

- Meaningful curriculum, begins in the immediate interests of children, and expands outward to more formal studies of the larger social world.
- Skillful teachers pay equal attention to cognitive, emotional, and social growth as well as to the multiple modalities through which children learn.

- Questioning, communication, and active participation framed by respect and responsibility provide practice in democratic processes that are designed to instill a life long commitment to the realization of a more just society.

Consistent with its commitment to the amelioration of social ills through education, the developmental-interaction approach, the formal name given to the newly articulated model, promotes adaptation to local conditions and gives primacy to social studies -- understanding the dynamic relationships of people interacting with their environment (Mitchell, 1934/1971). Literacy and numeracy are taught not as ends in themselves but in meaningful contexts, as tools that enable children to express their ideas and to explore the ideas of others. Skills instruction is systematic and planful, reflecting the needs of individual students and groups of children (Mitchell & David, 1992).

In addition to its roots in progressive education Project New Beginnings also reflects demands for more

developmentally appropriate practices, the standard advocated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), in public schools (Bradekamp & Copple, 1997; Cummings, 1990; Goffin, 2000). While progressivism, as practiced at Bank Street College, has a dual commitment to fostering individual growth and social change, developmentally appropriate practice has had a more singular focus on the psychological development of the child (Silin, 1995). Both traditions share a strong commitment to child-centered classrooms. As defined by Cuban (1984) such classrooms have the following characteristics:

- Student talk equals or exceeds teacher talk
- Most instruction occurs individually or in small groups
- Students help to choose and organize the content and rules of behavior
- Varied materials are available for student selection and use
- At least half of the academic time is devoted to activities that allow student choice, and

space allows for individual and small group work. (p.3)

While the last decade has seen important criticisms of developmentally appropriate practices and child-centered pedagogy (Kessler & Swadener, 1992; Cannella, 1997; Grieshaber & Cannella, 2001), other researchers have successfully used NAEYC standards to assess early childhood programs in public schools which they have found to be both narrowly academic and insufficiently simulating (Haskins & Alessi, 1989; Hatch & Freeman, 1988; Scickedanz, 1994; Walsh, 1989). This record suggests that traditional primary school practices travel downward far more easily than developmentally appropriate practices move upward into the grades (Rust, 1989). More recently, studies have emphasized the intellectual capacities of young children and the potential impact of supportive environments, especially for children deemed at risk because of poverty (Bowman, Donovan & Burns, 2001). Combined with the renewed enthusiasm for incorporating early childhood programs such as universal pre-k into

public schools, research that looks at how this can be done with maximum benefit for young students is especially urgent (Goffin & Wilson, 2001).

New Beginnings in Newark

Bluntly stated, in 1996 when the state-appointed superintendent identified Bank Street College as a key component in her five year plan to improve the dismal performance of Newark's children on standardized tests, the city was still a beleaguered, if much maligned, place in which to grow up. The school system serves many impoverished as well as working class families, in a landscape only just beginning to emerge from the impact of a decades-long economic decline (Anyon, 1997). The statistics on the financial and physical health of Newark's families are sobering.[1] They suggest that the root causes of the 1967 riots that shook Newark and became emblematic of urban despair across the country -- racism, unemployment, substance abuse, and inadequate social services -- have hardly been eliminated.

In the 1960s, Newark was one of many New Jersey school districts lacking the resources to face growing social problems, declining student achievement, and rising public criticism.[2] However, starting in 1984 and continuing until the state takeover of the district in 1995, the Newark Public Schools failed to meet state monitoring standards with respect to everything from the physical plant and fiscal management to the quality of instruction (Community Training and Assistance Center, 2000).

At first blush, Bank Street College (BSC) and the Newark Public Schools (NPS) make odd bedfellows -- the one private and the other public, one a cornerstone of progressive education and the other with far more traditional practices, one with a primarily white, middle class clientele and the other serving working class and poor African-American and Latino families. Given the additional strains of state takeover, New Beginnings attempted to structure a program that would focus on the daily struggles of teachers and on winning their trust. This commitment to understanding

the individual interests and learning styles of teachers, echoes the emphasis in the larger school reform literature on the phenomenology of change and its meanings for those on the front lines (Datnow & Costellano, 2000; Fullan, 2001).

New Beginnings staff developers were assigned a group of teachers whose classrooms they visited weekly in order to model best practices, assist in planning thematic curriculum, and provide feedback on newly acquired teaching repertoires. The overarching goal was to create child-centered classrooms that reflected the lived experiences of students. Often extended conversations took place during lunch, after school or at night on the telephone. Project teachers did not receive release time or professional development credits for their New Beginnings work until year V.

At the insistence of the Newark Public Schools, the Project began in 16 kindergartens in 16 different schools, evenly distributed among the 4 School Leadership Teams that comprise the district's primary schools. In years two and three of the Project first

and second grades were added. By its 4th year, the year in which the study reported here was conducted, the Project functioned in well over 100 k-2nd grade classrooms in 10 schools. At that time, in addition to the direct work in classrooms, the Project had grown to include: seminars and one-on-one mentoring for principals; a family-school collaboration component; a mental health component; a collaborative program with the New Jersey Audubon society; a dual language initiative; a program to connect elementary schools with local pre-school and day care centers. The Project employed 6 full-time and 9 part-time staff developers assigned to specific schools, 3 full-time and 6 part-time staff in various adjunct initiatives and a four person administrative team.

Teacher selection was a complex process that differed among the sites and over time. In 1996, the first year of the Project, for example, all the teachers appear to have been designated by an assistant superintendent. Some were notified directly by the central office, some by their building

principal or vice-principal. Some received extensive information, others very little. Some felt it was a privilege, a sign they were valued teachers. Others felt it was a burden, an indication that they were somehow deficient. In general, the teachers did not know how or why they were chosen, let alone what the Project hoped to accomplish.

The selection process was different for the teachers who joined the Project in the fall of 1997, the cohort we have followed most closely. During the preceding spring prospective participants had a chance to visit in New Beginnings classrooms and talk with the first cohort and their staff developers. The teachers who began that fall either taught kindergarten in a school where the Project was expanding to all the kindergarten classes or they were 1st grade teachers and were asked by their principals to work with the children from one of the original New Beginnings kindergartens. It is unclear what criteria principals used in selecting these teachers. We know from interviews that while some teachers were

interested in learning about the Bank Street approach others were reluctant -- albeit resistant -- to become engaged in yet one more curricular reform.

Indeed during the first two years of the collaboration participating teachers reported that they felt responsible to "two masters" -- Newark Public Schools and Bank Street College -- each of which placed different, often contradictory demands on their teaching. Here are teachers under direct state surveillance, working with new leadership at the top and within their schools, being asked to improve student outcomes on standardized tests with a program that radically reorders their teaching priorities.[3] It is understandable that many teachers choose to hedge their bets -- doing NPS in the morning and BSC in the afternoon.

Only in year III when staff developers worked together with teachers to utilize the structures put in place in the Project's first two years -- decentralized classrooms, student choice, active learning -- to implement a series of district literacy

initiatives was there a significant resolution of the two masters theme for many teachers. While the developmental-interaction model is most thorough in addressing questions of classroom life, it is weakest in its feint attention to the complex processes of institutional change. In Newark, however, New Beginnings staff were able to focus on institutional politics as well as teachers needs. They learned to function as street level bureaucrats helping teachers interpret and implement district policy in ways that allowed them to promote child-centered learning at the same time (Silin & Schwartz, 2002).

There is no small irony that a progressive institution such as Bank Street was called upon to transform early education in a district that was particularly pressed to show improvement on traditional measures of achievement. And while we can't claim a cause and effect connection between improved test scores and the New Beginnings intervention, we do note that in its first year New Beginnings kindergartners far out scored their non-New

Beginnings peers on a district wide test. As second graders, this same cohort out performed other Newark students on every component of the Stanford-9 achievement test, a trend that was continued when different components of the test were administered in third and fourth grades (Kapasci, in press).

New Beginnings was not the only staff development program enlisted to help turn the district around. Classroom teachers needed to contend with multiple initiatives, a not uncommon phenomenon in contemporary schools. In the fall of 1998, for example, the New Jersey Supreme Court required every school in each of the 30 tax poor Abbot districts to adopt a Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) model within three years.[4] The Project immediately set out to form partnerships with the CSR models in order to help teachers avoid the fragmentation that can occur when too many staff developers from too many different programs descend on their classrooms. While many of the CSR models are consistent with the theoretical underpinnings of New Beginnings, the additional

demands they place on time and energy undoubtedly affect teacher ability to focus on the Project.

Study Methods

Alysha's Day presents the findings of a study conducted during the 4th year of the Project to assess how teaching and learning were proceeding in classrooms of experienced New Beginnings teachers. In order to construct a sample that was broadly representative of the people and institutions with which the Project worked, we selected four of the ten New Beginnings sites for inclusion in our study. Each site was located in a different School Leadership Team and each was receptive to our ongoing presence. Two of the schools were small, with between 2 and 3 classes per grade level and with all k-2 teachers participating in the Project. Two of the schools were larger, with 4 classes per grade level and only half of all pre-k-2 teachers Project participants. In addition, two of the schools (one small and one large) had a limited number of extra classroom services available to teachers and students. Two of the schools

had active community programs and were considerably further along in the implementation of a Comprehensive School Reform initiative, i.e. most staff had attended trainings, and an on site coordinator had been designated by the building principal.

With the help of New Beginnings staff developers and administrators, we identified ten teachers at the four sites, three from the 1996 cohort and seven from the 1997 cohorts. At some sites there was a pool of teachers from which to choose while at others we worked with the only 1996 and 1997 teachers available. Ideally, we sought a representative sample of teachers who displayed a range of skills and differing comfort levels with the Project. To assure that overall our data included as many classrooms as possible; we excluded from the pool of study participants teachers whose classrooms were being used in other aspects of our research. Because we chose to look at classrooms of teachers who had been in the Project for 3 and 4 years, we were limited, with one exception, to kindergartens and first grades.

During the course of the study year we collected three types of data: observations, interviews, and surveys.

Observations

First, a total of 120 open-ended observations of 3 "target" children in each of the 10 study classrooms were made. The classrooms were visited a total of 4 times in the late winter and spring. During the visits, 20 minute open-ended observations were conducted in which we recorded everything that the target children did and said, everything that was said and done to them, as well as the activities in which the rest of the group was engaged. We observed a typical case sample of students (Patton, 1980). The target children were selected by the teachers in response to our request that they identify 3 middle range pupils -- extreme in neither their behavior nor academic performance. Additionally, on our visits we monitored shifts in the physical environment and instructional formats including: the number and nature of student, teacher and commercially made displays;

kinds of materials available to children; room arrangement; and formats and subject area of lessons and activities.

The open-ended observational data were coded along several dimensions using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These included content areas, lesson format -- individual, small and large group -- and the nature of teacher-student and student-student interactions. The types of student-teacher interactions that occurred during each of the three lesson formats were tabulated and translated into percentages of the totals observed. Similarly, overall peer interactions were also counted and converted into percentages.

Second, we developed and administered a structured observational protocol in the classrooms of New Beginnings and non-New Beginnings teachers. Given limited resources, this strategy enabled us to compare Project and non-Project classrooms on a key indicator of child-centered classroom life -- the numbers and types of interactions students initiated with teachers

as well as the teachers' responses. A total of 40 observations were conducted, 20 in the late fall-winter and 20 in the spring in the same classrooms. New Beginnings teachers with more than one year in the Project and who were not participating in the open-ended observation were randomly selected for this aspect of the study. Because most of the teachers on a grade level in a given school were participating in the Project, we asked the central office to designate non-New Beginnings schools in the same neighborhoods for comparison classrooms. Principals in these schools identified teachers for us to observe. At all sites, equal numbers of observations were conducted in the morning and afternoon to insure that we captured comparable time and activity periods in all classrooms.

Interviews

Outside of the classroom, we conducted individual 45-60 minute, semi-structured interviews with the 10 study teachers, their staff developers, and school principals. In addition, we conducted year-end

interviews with all 1997 cohort teachers and school-based focus groups with other New Beginnings teachers. We also conducted focus groups with all New Beginnings staff developers.

Questionnaires

Finally in order to obtain baseline data about classroom practice and track changes during successive years of participation in the project, all New Beginnings teachers complete a questionnaire just prior to their first fall with the Project and each spring thereafter. The questionnaire includes information about classroom layout, daily schedules, and percentage of their own and their students' time spent in individual, small group and whole groups activities.

Alysha's Day

In order to capture the texture and rhythm of life in New Beginnings classrooms as a typical student might experience it, we constructed a composite child's eye view of a single day. The events depicted here did not all occur in one day. We have drawn this

composite narrative of Alysha's day from the events and interactions that emerged as most prominent in the analysis of our observational and questionnaire data. Almost all of the conversations in Alysha's day are verbatim excerpts from our field notes in the 10 classrooms that we visited and all of the activities are ones we actually observed in these settings.

The strength of this form of re-presentation is that it allows us to provide a coherent narrative that captures the flow of a typical day for New Beginnings students and highlights the organization of space, time and curriculum as well as the nature of classroom discourse. Like Sennett's blended histories of working class men and Hanawalt's composite biographies of medieval children, Alysha's Day is our attempt to make students' lives vivid and bring the reader as close as possible to children's lived experience (Hanawalt, 1996; Sennett, 1973). At the same time that we clarify its strengths, we acknowledge that this narrative strategy also has drawbacks. Most significantly, it does not speak to specific differences across sites or

variations in the experiences of the 30 target students we observed.

Both New Beginnings staff developers and Newark teachers have read and confirmed the "verisimilitude" of Alysha's Day (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 416). Their corroboration of Alysha's Day as an "adequate representation of [members'] realities" (p.314) coupled with its direct, traceable links to our data suggest that our composite meets the criteria Lincoln & Guba (1985) posit for trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiry.

Teaching and Learning

It is 9:00 am as Ms. Davis' kindergarten class assembles on the rug. Ms. Davis greets the children, reminds them that they have a lot to do today, and cautions them about moving through the meeting quickly so they can go right to work at quiet centers. After reviewing the attendance and calendar, she asks for the weather person to come forward. Alysha, an African-American girl with large brown eyes and multi-colored barrettes adorning her

braided hair, moves to the front of the circle. When Alysha points to the sun she's drawn and says, "it's sunny," Ms. Davis asks if the rest of the class agrees. Ms. Davis calls for the tally person to raise her hand. Ivy stands next to Ms. Davis at a chart labeled Weather for February. It has pictures of four weather conditions and tally marks underneath each. Ivy shows the teacher where she's added an additional tally to the four previous marks under sunny. Ms. Davis questions the class about the name of the cross slash Ivy has made to indicate that there have been 5 sunny days so far.

Ms. Davis asks the group to look at the chart and decide what kind of weather they've had most so far in February. Many of the students say sunny, but some say cloudy. She says they will have to look carefully at the information on the chart to decide who is right. She asks how they will know who is right. A student replies if sunny has more tally marks, it will be sunny and if cloudy has more tally marks, cloudy will be right. Ms. Davis inquires about what they should do

next. Several students yell, "Count the marks." Counting the marks below each picture, the children note that sunny has more tally marks than any of the others and that snowy has the least.

"Ok, message time," Ms. D. calls as she begins to write on the board. Alysha and others try to anticipate the words she is writing. They say, "Good Morning" as she writes, but while the class says "boys and girls," Ms. Davis writes "everyone." "I fooled you guys. Look carefully at what I write. Don't just guess. Does this say boys and girls?" Ms. Davis queries. "No," say the children, and she helps them decipher "everyone." In the body of the message Ms. Davis informs the class that in the afternoon they will be cooking sap into syrup.

"Before we go to centers," Ms. Davis announces, "and since we're studying our tree and we're are going to make syrup I thought we'd read a book about something that goes really well with syrup." She holds up <u>P is For Pancakes</u> and asks, "Does anyone have an idea of what it is about from the cover?" "Pancakes!"

they yell. "Yes" she says. She holds up the book, reads the name of the author and asks what an author does. She repeats the same questions about the illustrator. Then she asks them what they see on the cover besides pancakes. Several children offer observations. Ms. Davis says, "Great, now let's take a picture walk through the book. What do you think might happen in the book?" Students offer their conjectures, and Ms. Davis begins to read. Alysha remarks that the syrup in the picture doesn't look like the sap they collected. Picking up on her comment Ms. Davis asks the increasingly restless group what they've noticed about the syrup in the book that's different from the sap they collected. Some students call out that the sap looks like water, but the syrup is darker, thicker, and stickier. Ms. Davis tells them to remember their observations for when they cook later in the day. It is almost 10 am when the book is completed and Ms. Davis dismisses the group to quiet centers.

The nearly hour-long meeting is a signal accomplishment of the New Beginnings day. It is a time when daily routines -- the weather, the calendar, attendance, the morning message, and schedule -- are carried out. Each of the activities is designed to reinforce math and literacy skills. The children present and absent are counted, the date is placed in ordinal sequence, sight words and punctuation in the morning message are identified. P is For Pancakes functions as an advance organizer for the afternoon cooking project and allows for review of reading strategies. Although the children are sitting informally on the rug there is a business like quality as Ms. Davis proceeds from one activity to the next. Consistent with a progressive perspective, the meeting confirms that there is a shared common purpose.

Physical Setting

In early childhood classrooms, the organization of space shapes teaching and learning formats and the materials available suggest valued forms of knowing (Cuffaro, 1991). During each of the first three years

of Project New Beginnings, teachers were given new furniture, for example, water and sand tables, materials such as blocks and cuisenaire rods, and supplies including paints and clay. The arrival of these supplies just prior to or near the opening of school prompted teacher-staff developer conversations about curriculum. Consistent with progressive commitment to honoring the multiple ways that children learn, the redesigned spaces and new materials put student activity rather than teacher talk at the center of the classroom. No longer required to stand in front of the room to deliver three part lessons to the whole group, teachers were free for the first time to step back, observe their students, and create plans based on a more direct assessment of student needs and learning styles. The systematic study of children became newly possible.

Prior to New Beginnings, classrooms were organized to maximize student focus on the teacher and the information and resources she managed for them. Clusters of student desks faced the chalkboard and the

teacher's desk at the front of the classroom. Classroom resources such as paper, books, and scissors were not accessible to the children. A few centers occupied distant corners of the rooms. By the end of their first year with the Project, teachers had re-organized their classrooms to encourage student movement, make centers more prominent, and to place classroom resources well within everyone's reach.

As Table 1 indicates, New Beginnings teachers have altered their classrooms dramatically. Teachers from the 1997 cohort were asked to draw maps of their classrooms prior to beginning their work and in the spring of each subsequent year. Before joining the Project fewer than half of the kindergarten classrooms and none of the first grades had areas for open exploration such as blocks, dramatic play, sand and water. In contrast, by Year IV many of the New Beginnings classrooms had added these areas as well as cooking and science centers.

Curriculum

The district's strong focus on literacy is reflected in our observation of 151 lessons (see Table 2). Activities including shared and guided reading, morning message, skill instruction and writing account for 73% of the lessons observed in 1st and 2nd grade classes and for 51% in kindergartens. Although we observed only 4 whole group math lessons, number concepts and skills are infused into morning message time, daily surveys, and estimation tasks. Math games -- dominoes, coin sorting, and Chinese checkers -- that reinforce basic concepts and provide practice with simple operations are part of center activities. With an increasingly integrated day, once discrete subjects are blended into each other.

Many of the curricular activities in Alysha's day are integrated with the study of trees and sap collection. During the early winter, students had the opportunity to tap a maple tree for sap during a Project-initiated trip to an outdoor ecology center. Now, prior to afternoon centers -- when students have

the option of working with a range of open-ended materials -- Ms. Davis will call the group together and ask them to predict what will happen when the sap is heated. She will record each child's prediction on an experience chart -- *"It will get dark and sticky." "It will be hotter." "It will taste sweeter." "It will get thick."* Following afternoon center time the children will have the opportunity to compare their expectations with what occurred when a small group cooks the sap into syrup.

The emphasis on science reflects participation in a New Beginnings Science Inquiry Project, an important goal of which is to demonstrate how to integrate literacy and meaningful content.[5] These studies offer teachers an avenue to develop themes and engage students in the work -- thinking, questioning, and researching -- of the scientist. On each of our visits we note that science centers are the most lively and stimulating areas of the classroom. We see more change and development in this area than in all the other classroom centers. Where in the past there might have

been a lone aquarium or a few pinecones scattered on the science table, now there is evidence of ongoing student exploration. There might be organized specimens from different trees, tanks of goldfish and snails, charts of student observations and descriptions of class experiments. Teachers tend to interact more with students in the science area than other open-ended areas like blocks and dramatic play, and to convey clear expectations to students about their work.

Instructional Formats

As the group meeting ends Alysha and the others stretch, wave their arms in the air, and listen to Ms. Davis announce, "People who haven't finished writing their wind stories need to work with me at the writing center. Some people will be working with Mrs. Jackson on little books. Others can either finish your observations and drawings of parts of a tree in the science center or play the new dominoes number game I showed you yesterday. It's in the math center." Then Mrs. Jackson, a teaching aide, reads from a note card

the children who have yet to read with her this week. Mrs. Davis calls these 5 students, checking their names off on a chart with the names of all the students down one side and activities for the week listed across the top. Ms. Davis calls Alysha and 3 other students to the writing center where she hands them their pictures of a tree with "the wind" written at the bottom.

Ms. Davis pulls a chair up next to Alysha and says, "Ok talk to me Alysha. What did you draw about the wind?" Alysha responds, "I drew a tree moving in the wind like we saw on our trip." "What are you going to say about the picture?" Ms. Davis queries. Alysha, "The tree is big." Ms. Davis, "Is that what the picture is telling you? I thought you just said that the story of your picture was the tree is moving. How about making your words match your picture, Alysha?" Alysha doesn't respond. Ms. Davis continues, "Let's write the story you said, OK?" Alysha nods. Ms. Davis, "You've already written 'wind' here. What else would you like to say?" Alysha says, "the wind blows." Ms.

Davis comments, "Well that's a beginning, but I know you can say more. What does it blow? How does it blow?" Alysha thinks for a moment and adds, "The wind blows the tree." "Ok" says Ms. Davis, "Let's write that. I'll help you start."

Ms. Davis and Alysha sound out the initial letters in the word "blows." As Ms. Davis moves on to the next child, she reminds Alysha to use the word wall if she has difficulty. Stuck for a moment she asks Teddy who is also at the writing center, "How do you spell tree?" Teddy says, "I don't know tree, tree. See if it's on the word wall." Just as Alysha gets up from her seat Teddy yells, "Oh, oh I found it, look." He points to the word "tree" on the experience chart about the tree the class is studying. Alysha goes back and forth to the chart laboriously copying the word one letter at a time.

When Alysha has finished the entire sentence, Ms. Davis offers her a choice between the math and science centers. Opting for the latter she collects her science notebook from a bin and joins a group of

students who are looking through trays of pinecones, pine needles, acorns and leaves. She questions Alfonse, "What we supposed to do?" He tells her they are to examine the specimens and decide which ones belong to the same kind of tree, and then draw the ones that go together.

New Beginnings teachers have decentralized both the physical layout of their classrooms and the way they teach. One of the most striking changes has been the shift away from whole group instruction to small group and individual formats. Prior to the introduction of New Beginnings, 1st grade students spent close to one third of their day doing paper and pencil seatwork (see Table 3), and teachers spent almost half of their instructional time directing these activities (see Table 4). Whole group activities signaled the beginning and end of most lessons and were similar in structure across content areas. Teachers often instructed the group in a specific skill and then asked students to complete an independent or small group follow-up assignment based

on a worksheet or drawing task. The class would then reconvene to share their work.

By contrast, during the fourth year of the Project, large group lessons -- other than morning meeting -- have primarily become a forum for preparing students to proceed with independent work and to reflect back on what has been done. For example, we saw teachers use whole groups to introduce a new game or material for one of the centers, review the "an" family with the help of words from the morning message, or offer guidelines for observing snails in the science center.

Shifts in the nature of classroom discourse accompany the curricular and instructional changes made by New Beginnings teachers (see Table 5). Teachers increasingly tailor their conversations with students to correspond to the tasks they expect them to accomplish. In large groups they invite students to talk and make observations. Teachers generally open these discussions with factual questions e.g. What is the illustrator's work? How did you come to school

today? What did Martin Luther King do? Then, they ask almost as many open-ended questions. These include observation and prediction queries about stories or science activities.

Small group work appears to be the least discursive and most directive of the instructional formats we observed. On the few occasions when teachers address small groups as a whole, it is to present a demonstration or to deliver instructions for completing a task. Most often, however, students working on the same task in small groups participate in one-on-one conversations with the teacher. Alysha and Ms. Davis confer on her wind drawing while a few other children complete their own stories. During this interaction, Ms. Davis challenges Alysha to make the content of her story about the wind match the picture she has drawn by asking open-ended questions. These conversations focus less on instruction in a specific skill or discussion of content than on the integration of skills and content into the endeavor at hand.

In individual sessions, teachers invite observation and feedback from students. At the same time, teachers give students feedback about what they have done and, almost 20% of the time, they suggest ways for them to extend their efforts. Encouraging children to reflect on their work and to take their words and thoughts seriously they gently admonish -- "I know you can write more than this. What else would you like to say?" Or, "How did you feel when you lost the game and what did your family say?" During these interactions, teachers model appropriate ways of generating ideas and finding words for thoughts.

This open-ended questioning stands in stark contrast to teachers' early efforts to discuss students' work with them. During the first year of the Project, teachers frequently fell back on rote questioning that seemed tangential to the gist of the students' focus. Questions were most often designed to insure that students grasped specific facts for which the teachers felt accountable.

In October Christine, a pre-k teacher, approaches two 4 year-old students who are making Halloween bats at the art table, tracing, cutting and pasting shapes for the body, eyes, wings etc.:

Christine: [about the bat that Ben is cutting] How many wings does it have?

Ben: Two.

Christine: What color is the bat?

Ben: Black.

Christine: How many eyes?

Ben: Two.

Also in October, while her class is working on a habitat theme, Louise, a kindergarten teacher, approaches a group of five year-old boys in the block area who are building an elaborate jail with a 'reflecting' pool from which they are providing frequent drinks for their animals and people.

Louise observes Charles putting a tiger in the pool to get a drink and without

questioning him about the structure or the animal's actions she asks:

Louise: Where might the tiger live? On a farm?

Charles: No in the jungle.

Louise: Wild animals kill farm animals.

Child-Centered in Newark: Adapting to Context

Our data on teaching and learning in New Beginnings classrooms reflects the hybrid nature of school reform. Here we see classrooms in which the social structures have become more child-centered but the curriculum has not. Curricular content is largely determined by adult rather than child interests or needs. The move toward new social structures begins with changes in the physical environment that allow for freedom of movement, access to materials, decentering of instruction, and peer interaction. The use of varied instructional formats allows teachers to tailor their pedagogy to the needs of individuals, to offer and receive immediate feedback from children, and to vary the nature of their discourse. The

importance of such diversity to later school success has been re-emphasized in the most recent report on the implications of developments in behavioral and social sciences for the early years (Bowman, Donovan, & Burns, 2001).

Reflecting contextual pressures to prepare children for standardized tests, our 4th year data suggests that although children's voices are increasingly encouraged in New Beginnings classrooms, the range of educationally meaningful venues for these voices has narrowed. With the push for higher scores on standardized tests the curriculum has become more focused on specific literacy skills and less responsive to children's ideas and exploration. There is now less opportunity for them to share their discoveries or concerns during the school day than during the early years of the Project. For example:

- With a few exceptions, morning meetings consist almost entirely of routines -- attendance, weather, calendar, and the morning message. Only 1 of the 10 teachers we observed and 25% of those completing

questionnaires occasionally include news or personal sharing time as part of the meeting.

- In year IV, honing in on the completion of class jobs, journal writing and/or independent reading as soon as their pupils enter the classroom, most teachers (83%) have eliminated the pre-class "free" choice time that many established in the preceding year.
- There is less classroom time allotted to work in centers with sand, water, blocks, and art materials. Like Ms. Davis, other kindergarten teachers only schedule these activities at the end of the day. In first and second grades, students often return to literacy, math or other assigned centers in the afternoon with no opportunities to work with open-ended materials.
- Teachers now spend more time administering individual literacy assessments during afternoon center time. This means they have fewer interactions with children as they work in centers and less

opportunity to build on the learning that is taking place.

- Increasingly during year IV student initiated interactions with teachers focus on how to complete teacher-assigned tasks rather than on their own discoveries. Students approach teachers 21% less in the spring than they did in the winter to talk about their own ideas and independent creations. They also approach the teacher 45% less than they did in the winter to discuss connections they have made between their work and basic concepts.

The hybrid curriculum that emerges from our data so far reflects the adaptation of progressive pedagogy with it dual commitment to individual development and social reconstruction to the realities of urban schools. Since Milbrey McLaughlin's (1976) ground breaking report on the Rand Study, the importance of adaptability has become commonplace in the school reform literature (Fullan, 2001). The New Beginnings experience underscores the necessity of accepting a

tension between a vision of what might be and the reality of what is.

Community and Connection

Classroom communities function effectively because individuals appreciate their connections to others, have a sense of shared purpose, and fulfill their responsibilities as group members. In the progressive tradition the individual and the social are not posed in opposition but understood as always in transaction (Cuffaro, 1995).

The Individual

It is 8:30 am when Alysha first arrives in her classroom. After hanging up her coat, retrieving her homework from her back pack and placing it in the appropriate work basket, and checking herself present on the attendance chart, Alysha moves to a nearby job chart and finds her name under a picture of the sun with "weather person" written beneath.

With no direction from the teacher, Alysha proceeds to the weather chart, a calendar with large boxes under each date. She looks out the window

several times and approaches Ms. Davis, "It's a sunny day right?" Ms. Davis looks up from the book that she is reading with Tyrone and suggests that Alysha ask Mrs. Jackson, the classroom aide, for help with her job. Alysha walks over to an older African American woman with a warm demeanor, who has just finished reading with Chantelle and repeats her question. Mrs. Jackson asks, "What do you think? Did you check outside?" Alysha nods. Mrs. Jackson asks, "Well, what did you see?" Alysha says, "I saw the sun and some clouds." "Was there more sun or clouds?" inquires Mrs. Jackson. "Sun" says Alysha. "So" replies Mrs. Jackson, "It's what kind of day, sunny or cloudy?" "Sunny" says Alysha. "OK," says Mrs. Jackson pointing to the chart, "go finish up your job."

Alysha replaces the marker and moves to a bin containing student journals where she finds her own. Before sitting down to write an entry, she joins a small group of girls who are gathered around a large Daily Survey chart. At the top of the chart is a question. Below it are two columns, "yes" and "no."

Each column has blank spaces with Velcro dots in the middle. Students' names on strips of paper with Velcro backing are located in an envelope beneath the chart. As Alysha approaches, Latoya is placing her name in the yes column underneath Andre's. Although she can read a few of the words in the question aloud, Alysha asks Latoya if she'll read the question to her. Latoya reads, "Do you like cayenne pepper?" Alysha laughs. "Remember that spicy chicken we ate yesterday?" Ms. Davis who is discussing a child's journal entry with him overhears their conversation and looks up, "Boys and girls, when you do the Daily Survey remember the name of the spice we used yesterday in making the African Chicken. It was called cayenne pepper. What happened when several of you tasted the chicken?" "We all was begging for water," says Tyrell. "Yes many of you were begging for water." replies Ms. Davis, "and some of you weren't. So when you do the daily survey today think about whether you liked the spice we added or not. Please remember to put your name right underneath the one above it. Otherwise what will

happen?" She pauses and adds, "We won't know if there are more yes's or no's."

Alysha finds her name in the envelope and places it on the Velcro dot after the last name in the "Yes" column. Alysha chats briefly with the other girls and listens as Dominique tells the group that her mother cooks really spicy chicken on her job at a local restaurant. Then she moves to her seat to begin her journal entry.

From the moment she enters the classroom Alysha encounters a series of messages about what is expected of her. Without teacher direction, she handles her attendance, checks the job chart and completes her assignment, participates in the daily survey, obtains her journal and begins an entry. Throughout the day, Alysha and her classmates will continue to work independently making choices about what they do, when to tackle teacher-assigned tasks, and when their work is complete. They move freely about the classroom as they make use of the tools and materials that are displayed on open, easily accessible shelves.

This careful structuring of student independence is consistent with a progressive approach to building classroom communities in which students assume responsibility for their own behavior. Teachers work to help children develop internalized controls rather than rely on the externally imposed rules of adults. Our observations suggest that the sense of ownership and self-reliance evidenced by Alysha is fostered in many New Beginnings classrooms by a physical setting with easy access to materials, the choices afforded children, and the messages teachers convey to students about their capacity to solve problems and make decisions on their own.

Student Choices. Before the group meeting Alysha decides when to complete a variety of tasks from attendance and the daily survey to her assigned job of weather person and journal writing. Later in the morning, after completing her wind drawing she will choose to work in the science center area and in the afternoon she will decide on block building. During the morning work time Ms. Davis assigns some students

to specific tasks while others are free to opt for one of the many literacy centers. In other New Beginnings classrooms individual students or predetermined groups rotate through the centers. Once they are done or while they wait for their turn at a teacher-led center, they pursue open-ended activities in the dramatic play area, read, or work with puzzles.

Prior to the Project, some Newark teachers used centers in the afternoons to reinforce earlier teaching or to offer a respite from more academic learning. Then, in the first years of the Project, there was a broad spectrum of centers open to children in both the morning and afternoon. Now, as noted previously, in many kindergartens materials such as sand and water, blocks and painting may only be available in the afternoon. In 1st or 2nd grade classrooms free choice center time is often completely eliminated.

Student-Teacher Interaction. New Beginnings students experience teachers who facilitate their exploration and self-expression. Overall, when

students approach teachers in New Beginnings classrooms, they are more likely than non-New Beginnings peers to receive a response and that response is more likely to be a positive comment[6] (see Table 6). New Beginnings teachers are also more likely to pose questions that redirect children to solve a problem on their own. When Ms. Davis is reading with Tyrone she redirects Alysha to Mrs. Jackson with her question about the weather. In turn Mrs. Jackson walks Alysha through her own observations rather than providing a quick answer. Later Ms. Davis sends Alysha to the word wall to find the correct spelling of unfamiliar words.

These small moments illustrate how teachers coach students in the use of classroom resources. As Table 6 indicates, between our winter and spring observations, redirects increased by 10% in New Beginnings classrooms and decreased by 45% in non-New Beginnings classrooms. Overall, Project teachers redirect students nearly twice as much as non-Project teachers.

Although New Beginnings teachers demonstrate slightly less of an increase in positive responses than their non-NB colleagues, when we take positive, redirect, negative and non-responses together, NB students receive more constructive responses overall. As Table 6 illustrates, the number of positive responses to students increases from the winter to the spring by 35% for NB and 41% for non-NB teachers. However, this is balanced by a 17% decrease in negative responses for NB teachers but a 28% increase for non-NB teachers. Likewise, while both groups demonstrate an increase in the number of times they do not respond to students, the non-NB teachers increased almost 4 times as much in this category as NB teachers.

Our data suggests that these contrasts in teacher response and classroom organization may result in different understandings for students of their work and the teacher's role in it. New Beginnings students appear to rely far less on the teacher as gatekeeper to activities, judge of when their work is complete,

and director of their physical movement. They look to the teacher for help in explaining how to use, not for permission to use, the material resources available in the classroom.

While NB students initiate fewer permission seeking interactions with their teachers as the year progresses, their non-NB peers initiate more. Changes in two of these behaviors -- requesting permission to participate in an activity and requesting permission to go to the bathroom, get a drink, or move somewhere in the room -- are especially revealing. Between winter and spring, New Beginnings student requests decline by over 20%, while their peers' requests increase by approximately 10%. Although the increase for non-NB peers is not large, the fact that it grows rather than falls as the year unfolds suggests that these students become more dependent on the teacher. We can infer from these figures that NB students increasingly feel they can make decisions about their classroom lives without seeking the teacher's approval.

Moreover, we can speculate that NB students feel they have more latitude than their non-NB peers do in determining whether their work is complete. While non-NB students make 10% fewer announcements to the teacher between winter and spring that they have finished a task, NB students make these announcements 39% more often.

Their self-reliance does not deter NB students from seeking the teacher's input about how well they are working or her help in completing a task. Both NB and non-NB students seek teacher approval more in the spring than in the winter. However, this behavior increases almost twice as much for non-NB as NB students. Seeking teacher approval can include asking the teacher vs. telling her if work is finished, asking her if work is correct so far, asking for her comments on work and/or asking if on has done enough to move on to the next task.

The Social

After the children have made their prediction about what will happen to the sap, Ms. Davis calls

them by the color of their clothing to choose an afternoon activity area. When pink is called Alysha takes a clothespin from the picture of the blocks on the center chart and pins it to her pink pants pocket.

In the block area Shaquira and Andre have already begun pulling long rectangular blocks off the shelf. Rather than join them Alysha stands and sifts through a box of books on the shelf until she settles on one that contains photographs of buildings. Eventually Shaquira and Andre join her as they identify a picture of a skyscraper they want to build. Andre asks, "Do we need some skinny ones?" Shaquira peers into the book, "Let's see how much." Alysha and the other children look at the picture in the book and discuss how to proceed. Alysha puts the book down, picks up two long rectangular blocks and stands them on their sides. Shaquira admonishes her, "Don't put them that way." Alysha picks up the long blocks and after checking the picture in the book again, she, Andre and Shaquira begin placing the long blocks on the floor to create a fence-like construction.

Shaquira takes a bin of plastic animals off the shelf and places animals on their building. Andre tells Shaquira to put a grasshopper on the fence. Shaquira says to the others, "Wait, we supposed to be building a house." Agreeing, they put the animals back in the box and return to the book. Andre says, "Now we need some of these small ones."

As Alysha tells Shaquira and Andre that they need more round blocks for their house, she looks around the room. She sees Latoya and Jennifer at the sand and water table busily measuring cups of sand. The girls are feverishly making cupcakes for the bakery/ice cream store they are pretending to run. In the dramatic play area, Alysha notices Janelle, Tommy and Lucinda busily setting the table as they discuss which family members are going to eat the meal they have just cooked. Scanning the room one last time she comments to Andre, "There are sure a lot of boys playing with Legos. You boys really do like those Legos." Andre nods.

As Ms. Davis flashes the lights, she begins singing the clean up song and tells everyone to gather in the cooking area once they have finished. Urging the children to stand back so everyone can see, Ms. Davis comments, "Let's look at the sap and compare it to the syrup we made. We'll see if our predictions were right." She shows the students the raw sap, passing it around in a container. As she scoops some sap with a spoon and pours it back into the container, she reminds them to be good observers. Then she does the same thing with the syrup they have made. Students call out excitedly about the differences in color, texture, thickness, and smell. Ms. Davis suggests that they look at their chart and decide which predictions were accurate and which were not. They put a check next to the ones they decide were accurate and an "x" next to those that were not.

Ms. Davis tells the children to return to their seats while Mrs. Jackson works with two helpers to prepare a special snack of vanilla ice cream and maple syrup drizzled on top. As the students eat, Ms. Davis

questions, "Does it taste like the syrup you have on pancakes at home? Will all those who think it does please raise your hands? Then will all those who think it tastes different please raise your hands." After the show of hands she finally queries, "and how is it different?"

A key outgrowth of the New Beginnings emphasis on independence is student immersion in a world of peer learning. Although Ms. Davis clearly structures and organizes the day, Alysha and her classmates actually do much of their work without direct adult supervision from the early morning routines to the afternoon block play. Alysha's life in the classroom is experienced primarily through peers; through their directions, observations, and requests. Ms. Davis is more of a guide and questioner than a direct physical presence in most of the students' daily activities. The majority of students look to peers before they approach a teacher -- Alysha asks Latoya to read the daily survey question to her, queries Alfonse about

how to proceed in the science area, and carefully chooses her own block building crew.

Altogether, student commentary on their own work, reflection on the achievements of peers, and discussions about organizing a task comprise almost half [45%] of peer interaction (see Table 7). With the picture book as their guide, for example, Alysha, Andre, and Shaquira discuss the kind of building they will make, the blocks they will need, and how to position them in the sturdiest fashion possible. Importantly, for their verbal, social and cognitive development, New Beginnings students are learning to anticipate and strategize with others, to describe their work, and to give feedback to others.

Although we have no data on peer interactions before the introduction of New Beginnings, we did observe student interactions in the first days of the Project. Then, student talk focused on maintaining the teachers' rules for social control in the classroom. Students threatened each other with ostracism as a way of resolving conflicts or invoked the teacher's name

as a way to mediate their differences. For instance, kindergarten students frequently called out "teacher, teacher" as soon as they experienced a conflict with peers or observed a peer breaking a classroom rule.

Gradually as teachers helped students become acclimated to more open classroom structures and the independence they afford, we began to observe the first attempts at peer collaboration. For example, our first year field notes contain descriptions of two boys playing word games on the computer repeatedly asking classmates for help matching letters to sounds and a kindergarten girl who spoke no English at the beginning of the year regularly using a classroom library book and chalkboard to teach a newly arrived non-English speaking friend to pronounce and read letters.

Today, New Beginnings students engage in a continual, seemingly fluid stream of co-operative interactions. Like Alysha, they may read with others briefly and then branch off to read on their own. They may devise an elaborate scenario about a family that

they enact in the dramatic play area for several consecutive days. Then one member of the group may move on alone to write a story inspired by that play. Within the structure created by the teacher, students define the amount and mode of their interaction with peers. Strikingly, the majority of these interactions are about the task at hand. They are what give New Beginnings classrooms their purposeful tone and resonate with the progressive commitment to community and communication.

Trade-Offs: Community and Curriculum

Building community in the classroom and studying the community outside its walls, are two essential aspects of the developmental-interaction approach that informs New Beginnings. Project teachers have gone a long way to accomplishing the former task, but have yet to consistently address the latter.[7] Following on the progressive tradition, schools prepare students to be active participants in a democratic society by offering many opportunities for individuals to be responsible community members and to study how larger

communities work. In the previous section we described the physical transformation of the New Beginnings environments, the easy access to tools and materials that promote student independence. The data presented in this section suggest that building daily surveys and activity choices into classroom life further encourages and deepens that self-reliance. The consistent use of "re-directs" by teachers reinforces the key instruction: students must become resourceful in answering their own questions. Although the teacher limits the range, students are also given frequent choices through which they can experience themselves as self-determining agents in the classroom. Even choosing how and when to complete teacher-made assignments encourages students to take greater responsibility for their own learning.

As we see in Alysha's Day, New Beginnings students have a set of complex social experiences. Learning to manage in a variety of situations that require different communicative competencies is part of a developmental-interaction emphasis on community.

The immersion in peer culture evident in New Beginnings settings is consistent with the goal of creating democratic classrooms. In describing her work as a Project staff developer, Nancy Balaban (in press) cites John Dewey:

> There is more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way they come to possess things in common. . . (Dewey, 1966)

Our data on student-student and teacher-student interaction indicate that New Beginnings classrooms are respectful settings in which controls are internally maintained rather than externally imposed. Importantly too, they are settings in which children experience responsive adults, a critical factor in promoting later social competence and school achievement (Bowman, Donovan, & Burns, 2001).

At the same time that we observed the building of community in the classroom, we saw less evidence, with

the important exception of science, that the curriculum itself reflects the extra-school community or the immediate interests of the children. Teachers did not appear to bring student experiences or thoughts into the classroom in ways that enhance understanding of the larger social world. In the 4th year of the Project, teachers were not encouraging students to initiate content-related conversations. When teachers approach students consistently about the work they have assigned but less about the work students create, students focus their interactions on the topics the teachers seem to value most. Overall, when students spend less time in the open-ended use of materials and self-directed exploratory play, they may have fewer opportunities to make their own discoveries and less to share with the teacher.

This evidence rounds out the picture of the hybrid curriculum. Teachers use child-centered strategies to promote caring communities where literacy instruction predominates. The absence of curriculum drawn from the children's lives creates

classrooms that are insular from not permeable to the social world in which they are embedded. From a progressive perspective, this is the trade-off: respect for children's voices and choices countered by a lack of input into what is deemed worth studying.

Progressive Pedagogy as School Reform

The demand for a coherent early childhood system, one that will involve public schools in the education and care of young children, will only increase in the coming years. Many social changes -- welfare reform, the ever expanding role of woman in the work place, the emphasis on early schooling as the key to later academic achievement -- all contribute to the demand for more and better early childhood programs. In turn, these demands will be tested in the coming years by a newly uncertain economy and continuing lack of political will (Rothstein, 2002).

The expansion of early childhood programs in public schools and the potential this brings for influencing pedagogy in the primary grades, reminds us that curriculum for young children remains an arena in which competing ideas about the purposes of education are open for debate. This, despite the movement in the

U.S. toward a greater national consensus about standards that is expressed in increased state control of the schools (Elmore & Furman, 1994). Differing perspectives on appropriate pedagogy for children of color and/or children of poverty remind us too that when we write about "trade-offs" and "hybrid" curriculum in Newark, it is from the perspective of change agents with a specific educational commitment (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Gordon, 1995). But from the point of view of some teachers and parents, New Beginnings may have simply brought a better way to achieve accepted goals. Social reconstruction through education -- the dream of early 20th century middle class progressives -- is not understood by everyone as a feasible or even desirable function of the school. For these educators and families, the silence about personal experience, about sometimes-difficult social realities outside the classroom, is appropriate. It is the way schools are supposed to be if individual children are to succeed in later life (Delpit, 1995; Rodriquez, 1982).

What does the New Beginnings experience tell us then about the potential benefits of progressive education in struggling urban school districts for

reforming early childhood education? The primary conclusion we draw is that it may be easier to transform *how* children learn than *what* they are expected to know. On the whole, the Project was more effective at fostering humane, child friendly environments than at broadening the curriculum. How do we explain the particular hybrid curriculum that emerged from the work of Project New Beginnings in Newark?

Here we propose three overlapping interpretations for our findings. First, like all school districts around the country, Newark is subject to a decade-long demand for higher academic standards, stricter rules of accountability and testing (Clark & Wasley, 1999; Gardener, 1999; Hirsch, 1999; Meier, Kozol, Cohen & Rogers, 2000). This despite growing evidence that standards-based instruction narrows the curriculum, increases grade level retention, negatively affects graduation rates for minority students, and does not improve future economic performance (Levin, 1998; Linn, 2000). The narrowing

academic focus has placed pressure on early childhood teachers to intensify instruction in basic literacy and math skills at the expense of other subjects. In Newark, ironically, New Beginnings supported this trend. The new child-centered classrooms enabled teachers to conduct the multiple individual literacy assessments and to implement the guided reading and writing programs promoted by the district.

Second, in the early years of the Project, teachers and administrators were still distrustful and apprehensive because of the state takeover. Rigorous central office monitoring, changes in administrative personnel, and state supervision did not create a climate in which radical changes could be easily undertaken. Needing to attend to the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, district curriculum guides, and in some schools to Comprehensive School Reform models, teachers could more easily shift how they taught than what they taught.

Third, in contrast to science, for example, building socially relevant curriculum appears to be a

more pedagogically challenging project for teachers. We note here that from the outset science had broad teacher appeal because it was academic, concrete, and built observation and recording skills. In contrast, social studies appeared to be a more open-ended, conceptually difficult subject, the value of which was less readily understood by teachers and administrators. For young children, social studies also means the exploration of the local neighborhoods, an undertaking some teachers resisted because crime, substance abuse, and poverty often masked the strengths of family networks and community institutions.

The uneven movement toward fulfilling the promise of progressive education in Newark speaks to differences in educational perspectives as well as to the set of constraints under which everyone -- teachers, administrators and New Beginnings staff -- is working. Our understanding of contextual issues -- high stakes testing, poverty, state takeover, multiple programs and change agents -- leads us to neither blame nor excuse but rather to underscore the difficulties of urban school reform. It suggests the

many practical barriers that prevent teachers from experimenting with curriculum drawn from children's questions about their immediate classroom discoveries or experiences in the community. It also suggests the very real achievement of so many who have shifted their traditional teacher centered pedagogy to one in which they are more often coaches and facilitators, enabling young children to become engaged, independent learners.

References

Anyon, J. (1997). Ghetto schooling. New York: Teachers College Press.

Association for Children of New Jersey (2000). Kids count new jersey 2000: State and county profiles of child well-being. Newark: Association for children of New Jersey.

Balaban, N. (in press). Creating a caring, democratic classroom community for and with young children. In J.Silin & C. Lippman (Eds.), Crossing the River: An urban success story. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bensman, D. (2000). Central park east and its graduates. New York: Teachers College Press.

Biber, B. (1967). A learning-teaching paradigm integrating intellectual and affective processes. In E Bower & W. Hollister (Eds.), Behavioral science frontiers in education (pp. 111-155). New York: Wiley.

Biber, B. & Franklin, M. (1967). The relevance of developmental and psychodynamic concepts to the

education of the preschool child. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 6,5-24.

Bowman, B, Donovan, M, & Burns, S. (Eds.) (2001). Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bredekamp, S. & Copple, C. (Eds.) (1997). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Cannella, G. (1997). Deconstructing early childhood education. New York: Peter Lang.

Clark, R.W., & Wasley, P.A. (1999). Renewing schools and smarter kids: Promises for democracy. Phi Delta Kappan, 590-596.

Community Training and Assistance Center (2000). Myths and realities: The impact of the state takeover on students and school in newark. Boston: Community Training and Assistance center. Available from CTAC, 30 Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108.

Cremin, L. (1964). The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.

Cuffaro, H. (1995). Experimenting with the world: John dewey and the early childhood classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuffaro, H. (1991). A view of materials as the texts of the early childhood curriculum. In B. Spodek and O. Saracho (Eds.), Issues in early childhood curriculum (pp. 64-85). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cummings, C. (1990). Appropriate public school programs for young children. (Report No.RI1888062012). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321890)

Datnow, A. and Castellano, M. (2000). Teachers' responses to success for all: How beliefs, experiences, and adaptations shape implementation. American Educational Research Journal, 37 (3), 775-800.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other people's children. New York: The New Press.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (1998). Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1966). Democracy and education. New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1916)

Elmore, R. & Fuhrman, S. (Eds.). The governance of curriculum. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fink,D. & Stoll, L. (1998). Educational change: Easier said than done. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan & D. Hopkins (Eds.), International handbook of educational change (pp.297-321). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gardener, H. (1999). The disciplined mind: What all students should understand. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Goffin, S. (1991). Creating change with the public schools: Reflections of an early childhood teacher educator (pp. 155-173). In D. Steglin (Ed.), Early childhood education: Policy issues for the 1990s. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Goffin, S. (2000). The role of curriculum models in early childhood education. (Report No. EDO-PS-00-8). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 443597)

Goffin, S. & Wilson, C. (2001). Curriculum models and early childhood education: Appraising the relationship. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Gordon, B. (1995). Knowledge construction, competing theories, and education. In J. Banks & C. McGee Banks (Eds), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 184-199). New York: Macmillan.

Grieshaber, S. & Canella, G.(Eds.) (2001). Embracing identities in early childhood education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hanawalt, B. (1996). The composite biography as methodological tool for the study of childhood in history. Marriage and Family Review, 24 (3/4), 323-334.

Haskins, G. & Alessi, S.(1989). An early childhood center developmental model for public school settings (pp. 79-97). In F. Rust & L. Williams (eds.), The care and education of young children. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hatch, J. & Freeman, B. (1988). Kindergarten philosophies and practices: Perspectives of teachers, principals, and supervisors. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3, 151-166.

Hirsch. J.D. (1999). The schools we need: And why we don't have them. New York: Anchor Books.

Kapacsi,R. (in press). Student outcomes on district and state assessments for the 1996-1997 new beginnings kindergarten cohort. In J. Silin & C.

Lippman (eds.), Crossing the river: An urban success story. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kessler, S. & Swadener, B. (Eds.)(1992). Reconceputalizing the early childhood curriculum. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kleibard, H. (1995). The struggle for the american curriculum. New York: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lagemann, E. (2002). It should not be left to chance: Ensuring a good education for all our children. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Levin, H.M. (1998). Educational performance standards and the economy. Educational Researcher, 27 (4), 4-10.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Linn, R.L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. Educational Researcher, 29 (2), 4-16.

McLaughlin, M. (1998). Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and

situated practice. In A. Hargreaves et al (Eds.), International handbook of educational change (pp. 70-84).

McLaughlin, M. (1976). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. Teachers College Record, 77 (3), 339-351.

Meier, D., Kozol, J., Cohen, J., & Rogers, J. (2000). Will standards save the public schools? Boston: Beacon Press.

Mitchell, A., & David, J. (1992). Explorations with young children: A curriculum guide. Maryland: Gryphon House, Inc.

Mitchell, L. (1934/1971). Young geographers. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Nager, N., & Shapiro, E. (Eds.)(2000). Revisiting a Progressive Pedagogy. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Patton, M. (1980). Qualitative evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ravitch, D. (2000). Left back: A century of failed school reform. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rodriquez, R. (1982). Hunger of Memory. Boston: Godine.

Roopnarine, J. & Johnson, J. (2000). Approaches to early childhood education. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Rothstein (2002, July 10). Rising school standards and cutting budget: Huh? The New York Times, p. B8.

Rust, F. (1989). Early childhood in public education: Managing change in a changing field. In F. Rust & L. Williams (eds.), The care and education of young children (pp. 116-128). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schickedanz, J. (1994). Early childhood education and school reform: Consideration of some philosophical barriers. Journal of Education, 176(1), 19-29.

Schulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Schultz, T. (1991). Developmentally appropriate practice and the challenge of public school

reform. In D. Steglin (Ed.), Early childhood education: Policy issues for the 1990s(pp. 137-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schwartz, F., Silin, J. & Miserendino, J. (2000). Project new beginnings: The third year. Available from: Project New Beginnings, Bank Street College of Education, 610 West 112th Street, New York, NY 10025.

Sennett, R. & Cobb, J. (1973). The hidden injuries of class. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Shapiro, E. (in press). Precedents and precaution. In J.Silin & C. Lippman, (Eds), Crossing the river: An urban success story. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shapiro, E. & Biber, B. (1972). The education of young children: A developmental-interaction point of view. Teachers College Record, 74(1), 55-79.

Silin, J. (1995). Sex, death and the education of children: Our passion for ignorance in the age of aids. New York: Teachers College Press.

Silin, J. & Schwartz, F. (2002). Staying close to the teacher. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basis of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Dewbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of school reform. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, D. (1991). Extending the discourse on developmental appropriateness: A developmental perspective. Early Education and Development, 2 (2), 109-119.

Wasley, P. et al.(2000). Small schools, great strides: A study of new small schools in chicago. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

TABLE 1: AREAS CITED BY TEACHERS IN CLASSROOM MAPS[8]				
	Kindergarten		Grades 1 & 2	
	'97	'00	'97	'00
AREA				
Art	26%	88%	---	33%
Blocks	53%	100%	---	75%
Cooking	---	63%	---	75%
Computers	46%	38%	---	33%
Dramatic Play	26%	100%	25%	75%
Library	100%	100%	100%	100%
Listening	26%	50%	37%	33%
Math	86%	100%	50%	100%
Meeting Area/ Rug	60%	100%	52%	100%
Water/Sand Table	13%	88%	---	100%
Science	53%	75%	25%	75%
Table Toys/ Pattern Blocks	53%	38%	25%	---
Writing	33%	100%	25%	100%

[8] By 2000, the 1997 cohort decreased from 36 to 22 teachers. In large part this attrition reflects a 1998 reduction in the number of schools with which the Project was working from 20 to 10. This consolidation did not lessen the total number of project classrooms since many new ones were added in the 10

remaining schools but it did mean that many of the 1997 cohort teachers were forced to leave the program.

While all 36 of the original 1997 cohort completed the 1997 questionnaire prior to their work with the Project, only 12 of the remaining 22 teachers completed the spring 2000 questionnaire. This difference in the total number of respondents in 1997 and 2000 raises the possibility that the 12 teachers who completed the 2000 survey were not representative of the original group. However, examination of the 1997 responses of these 12 teachers indicates few differences between their response and those of the original group of 36.

TABLE 2: LESSONS OBSERVED IN NB CLASSES '99-'00[9]		
	Kindergarten (N=111)	**Grades 1&2** (N=40)
Literacy:		
Reading story time guided reading skills instruction	38%	53%
Writing writers' workshop Journals	13%	20%
Morning Center Time Literacy Math Science	13%	20%
Math	11%	3%
Free Choice Afternoon Centers	9%	---
Science	5%	3%
Music	5%	3%
Cooking	3%	---
Social Studies		

[9] When an activity spans several disciplines, it was tallied in all of them. For example work in a science journal is recorded as both a literacy and science activity. Work on math stories is recorded as both literacy and math.

TABLE 3: TEACHERS DESCRIBE STUDENTS INSTRUCTIONAL TIME[10,11]				
	Kindergarten		1st/2nd Grades	
YEAR:	'97	'00	'97	'00
Seatwork	23%	9%	35%	16%
Small Group Work	36%	42%	31%	44%
Free Choice	21%	47%	17%	40%

[10] By 2000, the 1997 cohort decreased from 36 to 22 teachers. In large part this attrition reflects a 1998 reduction in the number of schools with which the Project was working from 20 to 10. This consolidation did not lessen the total number of project classrooms since many new ones were added in the 10 remaining schools but it did mean that many of the 1997 cohort teachers were forced to leave the program.

While all 36 of the original 1997 cohort completed the 1997 questionnaire prior to their work with the Project, only 12 of the remaining 22 teachers completed the spring 2000 questionnaire. This difference in the total number of respondents in 1997 and 2000 raises the possibility that the 12 teachers who completed the 2000 survey were not representative of the original group. However, examination of the 1997 responses of these 12 teachers indicates few differences between their response and those of the original group of 36.

[11] Some of the percentages do not add up to 100% for any given year because several teachers submitted percentages of students' time and their own time which did not total 100.

TABLE 4: TEACHERS DESCRIBE THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL TIME[10,11]				
	Kindergarten		1st & 2nd Grades	
YEAR:	'97	'00	'97	'00
Whole Group	46%	30%	48%	16%
Small Group	25%	47%	35%	43%
Individual	23%	23%	16%	26%

[10] By 2000, the 1997 cohort decreased from 36 to 22 teachers. In large part this attrition reflects a 1998 reduction in the number of schools with which the Project was working from 20 to 10. This consolidation did not lessen the total number of project classrooms since many new ones were added in the 10 remaining schools but it did mean that many of the 1997 cohort teachers were forced to leave the program.

While all 36 of the original 1997 cohort completed the 1997 questionnaire prior to their work with the Project, only 12 of the remaining 22 teachers completed the spring 2000 questionnaire. This difference in the total number of respondents in 1997 and 2000 raises the possibility that the 12 teachers who completed the 2000 survey were not representative of the original group. However, examination of the 1997 responses of these 12 teachers indicates few differences between their response and those of the original group of 36.

[11] Some of the percentages do not add up to 100% for any given year because several teachers submitted percentages of students' time and their own time which did not total 100.

TABLE 5: '99-'00 OBSERVED TEACHER INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS			
INTERACTION:	FORMAT		
	1 on 1 (N=73)	small group (N=50)	whole group[12] (N=173)
Open-Ended Questions	38%	18%	31%
Factual Questions	10%	13%	43%
Demonstration Direction	10%	42%	18%
Feedback	14%	----	3%
Distributing/ Suggesting Resources	12%	2%	----
Encouragement Suggestions	16%	21%	2%
Observation	----	4%	----
Discussion	----	----	3%

[12] Whole group does not include morning meeting.

TABLE 6: '99-'00 TEACHER RESPONSES TO STUDENT INITIATED INTERACTIONS N=20 TEACHERS		
Teacher Response	Percent of Change from Winter to Spring	
	NB teachers	Non-NB teachers
Positive	+35%	+41%
Negative	-17%	+28%
Redirect	+10%	-45%
None	+84%	+160%

Table 7: '99-'00 PEER INTERACTIONS N=242	
Helping Directing Correcting	31%
Sharing, Commenting on Discussing and Announcing work	29%
Co-operating	17%
Planning, Suggesting, Encouraging Explaining ideas	14%
Observing	5%
Competing, Arguing	4%

NOTES

[1] Newark's medium income of $21,650, for example, is slightly more than half of New Jersey's median income of $40,927. And with only 3% of the state's total population, 20% of Newark's children receive support through the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program. In addition, 47% of Newark's children live in single parent homes, triple the rate for the state. With respect to health care, Newark children fare little better -- 13.2% of children are born with low birth weight vs. 7.7% statewide, 8.1% of births occur without any prenatal care vs. 1.2% statewide; and there is a 13.3% infant mortality per 1,000 births vs. 6.3% statewide (Association for Children of New Jersey, 2000).

[2] Beginning in 1973, a series of court cases challenged the funding of public education across the state. In that year, the courts (*Robinson v. Cahill*) upheld the argument that a primary reliance on local property taxes for school financing lead to unequal educational opportunities for children in property poor districts and was thus a violation of the state's constitutional commitment to provide a "thorough and efficient education" for all children.

[3] When the Project entered Newark soon after the takeover, the district was especially unsettled. Anyon (1997) reports, for

example, that in 1996, 38 of 82 principals were deemed unsatisfactory; 31 subsequently resigned, retired, or were fired. In the summer of 1996, the state appointed superintendent also laid off 634 people, 7% of district employees. The Community Training and Assistance Center (2000) reports that by January 1998 a total of 250 administrators had been evaluated and that overall the districted promoted and reassigned 16 existing employees to principal and vice-principal positions and hired 32 new administrators.

[4] In 1997 federal legislation enabled schools to apply for $50,000 grants to assist in the implementation of 17 approved CSR models. The 1998 New Jersey court order specified five of these models as appropriate choices and designated Success for All/Roots and Wings, a highly prescriptive, skills-based program, as the presumptive model if none other was chosen. New Beginnings itself did not qualify as a CSR model. Like many early childhood curriculum models it is most accurately located somewhere between narrow staff development initiatives and more recent waves of school reform with their emphasis on school structure and governance (Fink & Stoll, 1998; Goffin & Wilson 2001; Roopnarine & Johnson, 2000).

[5] Although science is an essential part of Alysha's day, in fact approximately 20% (22) of all New Beginnings teachers opted to

participate in this program. The data we present here are from classrooms of teachers who had been in the Project for 3 or more years. Many of these teachers because they were more experienced chose to participate in this program. The Project's goal was to use science to encourage teachers to introduce more conceptual content into the curriculum.

[6] A positive response means that the teacher answers a student's question, discusses her comment, or responds affirmatively to a request. A negative response means that the teacher refuses to answer a student's question, discuss her comment, or denies a request.

[7] Recognizing this short coming, the Project initiated a social studies course for teachers during year IV. This was part of a larger effort to institutionalize its role in the district by shifting the way that it delivered services. Supplementing the one-on-one model of staff development with a range of minicourses and study groups, the Project sought to offer alternative venues for teacher change. At the same time, the district recognized the Project's work by giving teacher's professional development credits for participating in its programs and facilitating attendance during district wide staff development days.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Alysha's Day: Progressive Pedagogy as School Reform	
Author(s): Fran Schwartz + Jonathan G. Silin	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: ~~Jonathan G. Silin~~ Fran Schwartz	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jonathan G. Silin, Graduate Faculty; Fran Schwartz, Bank Street College
Organization/Address: Bank Street College of Education, 610 West 112th Street, New York, NY 10025	Telephone: (212) 875-4520 / FAX
	E-Mail Address: silin@aol.com / Date: 6/1/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)